

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PUBLIC MEETING

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had on March 6,
1995 at the Granite City Township Hall, Granite City,
Illinois.

* * * * *

MS. PASTOR: Thanks for coming. My name
is Sue Pastor. I'm the community relations
coordinator for this project for the NL Industries/
Taracorp Superfund Site. And most of you know Brad
Bradley, the project manager for the project. And we
have another person who may look familiar to you from
the last meeting. This is our court reporter that is
taking down all the proceedings for tonight. And when
we get to the public comment portion on the agenda, if
you are going to make a comment, a verbal comment,

1 come up to the microphone, and just like last time,
2 state your name, spell it, if you need to, if it's a
3 difficult name for the court reporter to pick up.

4 I hope you all signed in. We have two
5 sign-in tables, and that will ensure that you stay on
6 our mailing list, and make sure we have your correct
7 name and address, your name spelled correctly, and
8 your address is current. And the agendas, and we also
9 have extra proposed plan fact sheets. So if you
10 didn't get one in the mail, or if you would like an
11 extra one, feel free to take some more on your way
12 out, and that will explain some of the things that we
13 will be talking about, or all of the things we are
14 taking about tonight, and that is about our proposed
15 plan for cleanup for the site.

16 If you read through it, we have three
17 portions that Brad will talk about. The main
18 industrial area, and ground water, and remote fill.
19 And he will talk about that, and tell a little bit
20 about the history of the site. Then we will take your
21 questions. Then we'll take your comments. The
22 comment period goes through March 20. By the way, we
23 have had a request for extension for that comment
24 period already. So we will be taking care of that.

1 That will bring us to something like April 20, April
2 19. We'll count 30 days, and put a notice in the
3 paper. So we'll be extending the comment period
4 another 30 days.

5 If you like what you read, and would
6 really like to get into it, we have more documents
7 pertaining to the site over at the public library.
8 That information is in the depository, and the
9 administrative record. That is the file of everything
10 that leads up to our decision here on this project.
11 So if you'd really like to read this sort of thing, we
12 have a lot more over there. Otherwise, hopefully,
13 this will supply it for you, give you what you need.

14 By the way, we also want to mention that
15 we have the room until 10 o'clock. So we'll need
16 about 9:30 to break up and put the chairs away, and
17 things like that. So around 9:30 we will try to wrap
18 up, and you can hang around a little bit. If you need
19 to talk to Brad afterward about something individual,
20 brad will hang around. But we will be kicked out at
21 10 o'clock.

22 One more thing, too, I don't know if you
23 notice, but we have a gentleman videotaping back
24 there. It's just for our internal use. It's not to

1 put you on television, or anything like that. It's
2 just to tape the meeting, and the presentation, and
3 the comments, and questions that are asked so some of
4 Brad's co-workers can look at that who couldn't come
5 tonight. There's no reason to be leary of that at
6 all.

7 I'd like to also thank our friends from
8 Illinois EPA who loaned us their slide projector, and
9 are helping with the sign-in table. If you need
10 anything, Michelle is in the back of the room, and she
11 can get you anything you need. Bob Rogers is standing
12 in the back. He is going to work the lights, and he
13 can help you with anything, if you have any questions,
14 particularly State matters. We also have a new person
15 joining our team, and his name is Sam Burroughs, and
16 he is sitting in the middle here, and he will be
17 helping Brad with the field work that will be going
18 on. So if you don't see Brad at all in the
19 neighborhood or town this year, you most likely will
20 see Sam, and you can feel free to hail him down, call
21 him up, leave him messages just like you would do
22 Brad. If you need anything, Sam will be able to take
23 care of you.

24 So I guess I'll let Brad talk about the

1 history, and explain the proposed plan to you.

2 MR. BRADLEY: All right. Let's see.

3 What we are talking about again, for those of you who
4 may not be aware of this, is the NL Industries/
5 Taracorp Site located at 16th and Cleveland here in
6 Granite City. Do you need more lights down?

7 What I have up there is just a general
8 site location map, and the Taracorp smelter created
9 several waste streams that we've studied, and had
10 plans to deal with; one of which is the stack
11 emissions that settled in people's yards, and
12 contaminated a lot of the neighboring residential
13 yards with lead.

14 Another waste stream is the Taracorp
15 pile, which is the large slag heap at the main site
16 area. And then there is a third waste stream where
17 hard rubber battery case material was used as fill
18 material in the neighboring communities, such as
19 Venice and Eagle Park Acres. And what we are here to
20 talk about tonight is the Taracorp slag pile, and the
21 ground water contamination that is coming from that,
22 and also the hard rubber battery case material fill
23 areas. We've done some work on the battery case fill
24 areas, but because there is so many more of them than

1 we thought initially -- Once we got down there, we
2 found out it's really in about every alley in Venice,
3 and seemingly every other yard in Eagle Park. So what
4 we've done is, since that information that we were not
5 aware of at the time of the 1990 record of decision,
6 we're reevaluating that, as well as the Taracorp pile,
7 because ground water contamination that we discovered
8 in 1992 is something that we were also not aware of in
9 1990 when we had the initial record of decision to
10 deal with that pile.

11 What I will do is I'll go through the
12 alternatives. We've broken them down into three
13 areas, just for clarity, and also that gives us more
14 options to choose from than if we were combining them
15 altogether. The first area is the main industrial
16 area, and that is the Taracorp pile and the BV&G
17 Transport, Rich Oil property, and Trust 454 property
18 where St. Louis Recyclers used to operate. And the
19 alternatives were alternative M-A, which is really
20 capping the pile. This is basically the same
21 alternative that we had put in the record of decision
22 in 1990 to deal with the Taracorp pile.

23 Alternative M-B is taking the entire pile
24 and building a landfill on-site, and putting in that

1 landfill, as well as the contaminated properties
2 surrounding it, such as BV&G Transport, Trust 454.

3 Alternative M-C1 is source removal to
4 off-site landfill, off-site treatment of hazardous
5 waste. That would be basically taking the whole pile,
6 and other contaminated material around to a landfill,
7 and letting them treat it at the landfill.

8 Then we have alternative M-C2, which
9 would be simliar M-C1. However, we would treat the
10 material on-site; or another possibility following
11 this would be to take it to a treatment facility, such
12 as a secondary lead smelter that could hopefully deal
13 with the entire pile.

14 Then lastly, alternative M-D, which is a
15 rather extensive recycling option, where we actually
16 sort everything on-site into plastic, rubber, slag,
17 and every other element that is in the pile, and then
18 try to recycle or dispose of all of those various
19 waste streams separately. We are not going to recycle
20 plastic, and maybe melt down some of the lead. The
21 leakage that we found in the pile --

22 Just to run you through these briefly,
23 before I explain what alternative we are proposing
24 tonight to deal with the Taracorp pile, we evaluate

1 this with nine criteria. And you can just read
2 through these briefly. Things like overall
3 effectiveness of the remedy; will it take care of the
4 problem? And what is the long-term effectiveness?
5 Also, what is the short-term effectiveness? Will it
6 create a problem while you are putting it into place?
7 Also, compliance with the applicable laws, and also
8 whether or not we can do it. Obviously, that's
9 important. One, the technology exists, and can it be
10 done fairly easily, and cost, and then state
11 acceptance. What we are here today to address is
12 community acceptance.

13 Then that brings us to what our
14 recommended alternative about it is. I will say a
15 little bit more about this at the end of the
16 presentation. Our recommended alternative after doing
17 further studies on this and including, you know, the
18 consideration of the groundwater contamination is
19 alternative M-A, which is capping the pile. Basically
20 the same thing as we proposed, or as we actually put
21 into the record of decision in 1990.

22 Now, with respect to the remote fill
23 areas, again we found a lot more of them than we had
24 anticipated, and some of these area are a lot worse

1 than others. Some of the alleys have battery chips,
2 you know, from street to street; other ones just have
3 a few chips mixed in over a rather extensive length.
4 And we have two proposals. We can either deal with it
5 the way we have been dealing with it, which is RF-B,
6 which is basically remove it if it's over 500 parts
7 per million lead, and treat it on-site, or at the
8 landfill. That's what we've been doing.

9 Or we have RF-A, which is a combination.
10 Wherever we have a yard or something that is not a
11 paving use, like driveway or alley, we would dig that
12 up as we have been doing. But with the driveways and
13 alley, we would simply pave over it, if it's not
14 grossly contaminated.

15 And the one we are recommending is RF-A,
16 which is the combination of digging up the ones that
17 have uses that are not paving uses, and getting rid of
18 that, and back filling it, restoring it; and then also
19 paving over the alleys, driveways, et cetera that
20 aren't grossly contaminated.

21 Lastly, we have the ground water
22 contamination, which is again what we had detected in
23 1990, and the levels are fairly high. Sometimes they
24 are over 10 times the standard downgradient, or

1 downstream with respect to the ground water from the
2 pile itself, and the water moves in a south-southwest
3 direction.

4 And we have alternative G-A, which just
5 basically is monitor the situation, and allow it to
6 attenuate, which means the contaminated levels come
7 down naturally with time. Unfortunately, that will
8 probably be quite a bit of time, because lead doesn't
9 degrade as readily as some other chemicals.

10 We have alternative G-B, which is
11 basically the containment the water on-site runs down,
12 and then not let the contaminated run expand at all,
13 and then the water that we have to extract, to contain
14 that we would take it to a publically-owned treatment
15 works, which we have got increments.

16 And the last option for the ground water
17 is more extensive remediation, where we would do the
18 containment, but also install what is known as a
19 slurry wall, which is a vertical barrier that would
20 prevent the ground water from moving any further in a
21 given direction. We put the vertical barrier up to
22 keep it from moving any further, and then also extract
23 the water as in G-B, and dispose of it at the local
24 public ground water treatment works.

1 And in any of those options, we would
2 also monitor it. We would be monitoring the
3 situation. The only way we have to do that is to
4 follow the initial network of wells that was placed
5 and don't really go off the property. It doesn't go
6 any further than Trust 454, since we have contained it
7 in those wells. We've got to put some wells further
8 down in the south-southwest direction to see how far
9 the contamination has gone.

10 And the recommended alternative for the
11 ground water is G-B, which is basically containing the
12 contamination and disposing of the water that we have
13 to extract, contain that at the publically owned
14 treatment works.

15 Then just -- This is just a summary of
16 the recommended alternatives. And the next step that
17 we are going to take is, as Sue said, we've already
18 had a request for an extension for the public-comment
19 period, which brings us up to something like April 18
20 or 19. Once we get all the comments in, then we will
21 prepare a responsiveness summary to those comments.
22 Then we'll issue a decision backing it that will
23 explain, you know, what we are actually going to do
24 for those three source areas that are the Taracorp

1 pile, the ground water and the remote fill areas that
2 we have dealt with already. And just to give you a
3 kind of guideline, we hope to complete that analysis
4 and response to the comments by approximately the end
5 of June this year.

6 And I want to just go through three
7 points briefly. There may be some misunderstanding
8 with respect to what capping is. First of all, and I
9 worked on another site, an asbestos site, that is
10 obviously not too attractive as the Taracorp pile is,
11 and this is an aerial view of the site before we did
12 anything. You can see the white area where they had
13 been dumping fiberglass and asbestos. There is a lot
14 of water in there where they settle out the asbestos
15 and fiberglass fibers from their waste water, and then
16 there is also some dry waste areas where asbestos
17 fibers are basically sticking right up in contact with
18 the air.

19 And this is located right on Lake Michigan.
20 And then this is what some of the close-up shots look
21 like. They used off specifications rolls of waste;
22 basically sludge to build this. This is what it
23 looked like before we did anything. This is all waste
24 material, and there is a shot, a long one, of the

1 ponds. Again, all of that stuff in the foreground is
2 either asbestos in a free form, or an
3 asbestos-containing product that's off specification.

4 And then the shot here is -- This is
5 after we had done the surface grading of the site, and
6 had placed the first layer of the cap. In this case,
7 this cap is a little bit different than what we would
8 do here. The first layer was sand. So what you see
9 there is now sand. Sand is covering all these
10 asbestos-containing areas. And then lastly we put
11 clay, then topsoil down, then planted sort of a native
12 grass species on top of it. The grass had not fully
13 grown at this point. You can see all the green area
14 where the grass was taking at that point. That was a
15 couple years ago. Now it just sort of looks like a
16 park up there. And I know that I have heard some
17 people say some comments about capping. I just want
18 to clear it up, that what we are talking about is not
19 going to look like it does today. It will be
20 something where we put roughly a three-foot layer of
21 various materials over it, and grow vegetation on top.
22 You can turn the lights back up at this point.

23 Another issue I wanted to just briefly
24 address was the idea of dust when we would be grading

1 the pile for the capping. And this is something that
2 we've done a lot of research on with the realization
3 that in moving this material around there is a
4 potential that dust can be generated. Simply watering
5 or something like with a firehose probably wouldn't
6 control it. But what we've put into a cross testing
7 for capping is a provision for rather extensive dust
8 control measures. We feel that we can certainly
9 control the dust at acceptable levels, which will also
10 control another concern, and that is recontamination
11 of the yards that have already been remediated. There
12 are a handful of yards that have been cleaned up that
13 are all very close to the smelter and the Taracorp
14 pile, and we feel that we can also control that.

15 And lastly, just a word on, you know, the
16 reevaluation we went through why we are proposing the
17 capping. I think that we probably -- the biggest
18 burden on everyone's mind is what we do with the pile
19 more so than probably remote fill areas, especially in
20 Granite City. And what it boils down to is capping
21 and removal of the pile would both take care of the
22 direct contact problem. If someone were to climb the
23 fence and get on the pile, the cap would put about a
24 three feet barrier between that person and the waste

1 material. Taking the pile out obviously would get rid
2 of the problem entirely, but both of them would take
3 care of an individual actually getting into direct
4 contact with it. And in the case of a kid getting it
5 into their mouth and ingesting it. Then another
6 concern with the pile is dust. Although dust levels
7 are not over the standards, it's obvious that there is
8 some dust that is still released from the pile.
9 Capping would take care of that, as well as the
10 removal of the pile entirely. And the only major
11 difference between the two is if you take the pile
12 out, you've taken the source of the ground water
13 contamination away. If you cap it, what that does is
14 drastically slows down the rate at which the lead
15 leaches out of the pile. It's not clear to us whether
16 that rate would be within the standards or not at this
17 point, but the difference in cost between the two is
18 about approximately \$30 million. To cap it is about
19 \$5 million, to remove it entirely is about \$35
20 million, and what we've faced was a decision of, okay,
21 if we spend \$30 million to get rid of it, what do we
22 get back? We really don't get a lot back for that.
23 All we do is remove the source of the ground water
24 contamination, but under the alternative that we are

1 proposing with the ground water alternative, G-B, we
2 are going to contain that contamination, and we also
3 don't have anyone drinking that ground water. We
4 don't have anyone here identified. We checked, and I
5 think everyone is on City water. That is really why
6 we are faced with a cost effectiveness decision. That
7 is why we chose the capping. We didn't feel it was
8 worth \$30 million more to take care of a ground water
9 problem that we can actually contain quite easily for
10 a lot less money. And we did do a lot of research on
11 it. That's one reason why -- We had initially wanted
12 to combine this public meeting with the public meeting
13 we had a couple months ago with the soil cleanup level
14 for the residential areas. But we did a pilot study
15 on the pile where we actually were doing six test pits
16 into it, and we saw -- We wanted to see how effective
17 our dust control measures might be. We also checked
18 for lead contamination or organic contamination and
19 fuel value for the purpose of seeing whether a
20 secondary lead smelter might be able to take the pile.
21 And unfortunately, the results of that made it clear
22 that if a secondary lead smelter were to take the
23 pile, it would take them a long time to get rid of it,
24 because the lead content was so high that they would

1 have to mix in a little bit of this pile slowly over
2 time. And just a ballpark estimate of 20 years was
3 given to us. But I went by an individual's estimate
4 that it would take 20 years to get rid of that pile at
5 that rate. And with all of that in mind -- We didn't
6 get a firm estimate from any smelters, either. We got
7 indications that the cost of taking it there would be
8 similar to the landfill option, which is about \$35
9 million. So that is the research we did on it, and we
10 checked the cost estimates very carefully. Because,
11 to be honest with you, I would rather have the pile
12 out, if we could afford it. We are just not getting
13 much result for the extra \$30 million.

14 So with that, we will just move on to the
15 questions. Okay.

16 MS. PASTOR: What questions do you have
17 for us? Anything? Would it be easier -- I don't know
18 if you need to come to the mic. Can you?

19 Q. No. You can hear me. I can yell for
20 hogs, and they'd hear me. My question is: You are
21 talking about pumping the water out of the ground and
22 putting it into our sewer lines to go out to the
23 treatment plant, and expect our treatment plant to
24 treat the lead before the water is put out into the

1 Mississippi or whatever. I think it's the
2 Mississippi. Now, what in the world do you use to
3 kill this lead? I mean, it's been seeping into the
4 ground for so many years now, how do you kill it?
5 What do you use?

6 MR. BRADLEY: Well, you don't really kill
7 lead.

8 Q. Well, I know.

9 MR. BRADLEY: I understand there are some
10 compounds that can actually destroy certain things.
11 Unfortunately, that is not the case with lead. But
12 what you do is if it's feasible and it exceeds the
13 standards for this stream, which I guess it would be
14 in this case, since it's over the limit, it would
15 basically just who knocks it out of the water and
16 makes it so that the lead can be combined with
17 something that would just take it out of the water,
18 stop it. That is what this would do? I wouldn't want
19 to see it just pumping right into the Mississippi.

20 MR. BRADLEY: No. We would extract it
21 from several wells. And some of the wells might not
22 be contaminated. We might just need to do that to
23 contain it. Obviously, some of the ones we wanted out
24 where the edge of the flume is we will be overseeing

1 by the flume, and we wouldn't discount that, because
2 not --

3 Q. The reason I ask that question, too, I
4 know of so many people that have wells in their yards
5 just to, you know, water the grass. And, you know, if
6 it's got lead in it, it would be going right into the
7 ground where they are watering.

8 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. Well, that is true.
9 One thing that would be important to utilize is if the
10 ground water is flowing as slowly as we seem to think
11 it does, it may not run at all. Even though it's been
12 years and years, the pile has been impassive. But
13 that is something we need to determine.

14 I know of one individual who has a well
15 for watering that we are going to test to see if
16 that's actually something that has picked up the lead.
17 I don't know if it's down any further. I don't know
18 how many other people have. He is the only one I am
19 familiar with. We will check that and see what we
20 get. Just so you know, the relative concentration
21 when you are dealing with the water, the standard
22 is -- The state standard is 7.5 parts per billion of
23 lead. It's actually very diluted. That's the -- That
24 is what causes the health impact when you are talking

1 about soil, the level that the EPA has been using for
2 its cleanup, 500 parts per million to clean up for
3 that, such as soils, that's actually about a thousand
4 times more concentrated. So if someone is actually
5 putting in water on the surface, it's not nearly as
6 concentrated as the lead in the ground already there
7 in the contaminated sources. I don't know to what
8 extent the buildup is over time, but it's not nearly
9 as much of a problem as the smelter stack was. It
10 won't create this magnitude of a problem where you
11 have, you know, gross numbers of blocks that are
12 contaminated over the cleanup levels that were chosen
13 in this case. So, it's still a concern. We want to
14 check this, but I don't believe the levels are that
15 much different. I don't think that would be a serious
16 problem.

17 Q. Do you know of anybody that has these
18 wells? Do they have the water treated somewhere?

19 MR. BRADLEY: We are going to test one of
20 them. It's close enough that it's probably one of the
21 best ones to test. We'll see, first of all, if it's
22 gotten that far. And since those wells really are
23 drawn off the surface, I don't know whether they will
24 be at the same level as the wells that we've drilled.

--
--
1 We've drilled some at the surface, some deeper; some
2 are around 70 feet deep. So it will be interesting to
3 see, first of all, who has it; and if so, does it
4 match up with the water we have. We are going to
5 check that seems that's the pattern this has given off
6 so far.

7 Q. Next question: I understand you are just
8 going to level this pile off. Is that your idea,
9 level it off and cap it? Is that what you mean?

10 MR. BRADLEY: No, it's not to spread it,
11 but leveling it off is the wrong way to describe it.
12 It has contours of its surface. There are some bumps
13 and some valleys, and we need to smooth those out.
14 But we wouldn't just flatten it to say three feet over
15 10 acres. Right now it's something, I guess, like
16 maybe 20 feet tall at the peak, and covers three and a
17 half acres. We have soil around it that has some
18 battery chips, and also a high level of lead
19 contamination in the Transport and the Trust 454. We
20 can use to sort of fill in some of those valleys. One
21 thing that is a problem that will require grading of
22 the pile and is something we'd like to minimize, is
23 that regulation for the smelter slope. Besides the
24 slope of the cap, it will be a much more gentle slope

1 than what they have on the edge of this pile
2 currently. So with Taracorp sitting right next to the
3 pile, and some rather steep slopes, we will have to
4 pull some of that back. Otherwise, you have to build
5 it out onto the paved area, which is not something we
6 want to do. There will be some grading. In fact, on
7 the borders, one that borders 16th, which is right up
8 against the rail, there is a street. We might pull
9 that back. Also, the side that faces into Taracorp's
10 paved areas, we will have to also pull that back and
11 slope it. Otherwise, we will try to, you know, not
12 level it out, but grade it to a smooth surface with
13 the material that grows up around it, and try to
14 minimize the area we have. The less grading we have
15 to do the better. But we are not flattening it, not
16 at all.

17 Q. That's what I wanted to know.

18 MR. BRADLEY: We might get it a little
19 bit shorter than that, but it's not going to be
20 flattened. That's actually something we would be
21 interested in hearing comments about. Flattened, in
22 your eyes, or, you know, just think about it.

23 Q. You actually expect to pump out all the
24 water, super soil water, through sewers or pipelines

1 in the treatment plant?

2 MR. BRADLEY: We don't have to pump out
3 all the water. What happens is when you have sources
4 of contamination, you get what is called a flume that
5 comes from that. And that kind of tends to have
6 certain dimensions. Generally, in most cases it's
7 shaped kind of like a pear. Right at the source it's
8 thinner, and as it goes out, it's gets fatter like a
9 pear. All we have to do is control that part of the
10 water where the flume is. We generally wouldn't be
11 putting the wells right at the edge of the flume.
12 We'd put it in a couple hundred feet, because when you
13 pump, you are actually pulling that leading edge in
14 anyway. I don't know what you mean by pumping all of
15 the water, but we have to deal with a relatively small
16 area, too.

17 Q. How are you going to determine how much
18 water you are going to get out, measure it? Doesn't
19 it contaminate any of the surrounding well water?

20 MR. BRADLEY: What do you mean by --

21 Q. Why are you removing the water in the
22 first place? You are removing it to get the lead out,
23 because you're worried about what she said that some
24 people have wells in their yards that they water

1 gardens and vegetables and everything else with. This
2 leaded water and contamination of any other well water
3 would be in the area. We've got layers of water.
4 Every time we get a flood, that area fills up again.
5 Whether you realize that or not, you are not going to
6 get rid of that, and have that lead pile, and always
7 have problems with the lead seepage into the water.
8 That gets under there then into the surrounding
9 underwater area.

10 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. The reason that we
11 are doing it isn't just the idea of people putting in
12 shallow wells to water lawns. It's really that we
13 have, you know, we have contamination coming from the
14 pile, and we don't really just want to let it go
15 unchecked. And we are not pumping it out necessarily
16 with the lead out as much as to make sure that the
17 number does not get bigger, and get into an area where
18 it may be at some point someone may actually drill a
19 well for drinking water. I don't see that happening.
20 But I don't think it's also a very good approach
21 environmentally to just allow a contaminated flume
22 that has the higher levels that we see here to just go
23 without any kind of extraction.

24 Q. Let me mention one thing. It seems to me

1 like the sequence -- That your operation has not
2 really addressed the real primary thing, and that is
3 that pile is the real big headache in this whole deal.
4 It's what has caused it. When the lead operation was
5 working, it spread the dust. Why don't you take care
6 of the lead pile before you take care of the yards and
7 everything else in the area? You can possibly
8 recontaminate adjacent areas.

9 MR. BRADLEY: Okay. Yeah. That's
10 something we've fully been through on several
11 occasions. The reason that we are doing it in the
12 sequence we are doing is, number one -- Your concern
13 is a legitimate one about recontamination. It's also
14 something we are concerned about. We feel we can
15 control it, or we would not propose to do anything
16 that grades the pile, or moves it in any way. We can
17 control that, and it wouldn't lead to significant
18 recontamination. It is our best judgment that the
19 yards that children play in that have higher
20 contaminant levels are really the priority. And that
21 if you look at what someone is being exposed to in a
22 yard, kids can play and actually get right into the
23 contaminated dirt. They can get that into their
24 stomach, and into their blood stream. And actually we

1 have had some blood lead levels in blood that are over
2 the cutoff we like to see; a blood study that was done
3 on the pile. The entire area is fenced off. So
4 someone getting on the pile would be very difficult.
5 Certainly the target group, which is smaller children,
6 would be very unlikely to get over the barbed wire
7 fence into the pile. So, it's not really something we
8 feel needs to be covered. That is not really a
9 pressing issue, not nearly as much as kids that can
10 get right into a yard that is contaminated.

11 As far as dust goes, you know, monitors
12 have been operated for a number of years by Illinois
13 EPA to check for levels of dust that is coming off
14 that area, not just the pile. But in the past, there
15 is also a smelter stack, and that effort is what
16 initially lead to the, you know, the smelter shutting
17 down is that the levels were sometimes four times the
18 standard for lead back in the early '80's. So the
19 smelter operation itself shut down, and also the St.
20 Louis Lead Recyclers shut down their operations,
21 pulling portions of the pile trying to recycle some of
22 the lead. Since then the lead levels have been much
23 lower. And in general, they are about one-tenth of
24 the standard to about one-eighth of the standard. So

1 they are low. We don't feel that health standards for
2 that is being met very well at the area around the
3 pile. One thing we may want to do is put some
4 monitors a little closer into the pile, because there
5 are two of them that were taken out of service since
6 the lead levels started going down. Two of them have
7 been taken out of service. We don't feel that is a
8 significant problem either. It's well within the
9 standards. As far as the ground water is concerned,
10 you have to have a complete pathway to actually have a
11 health concern. We know that the leads in the water,
12 someone actually has to drink it for it to be a
13 problem. I don't mean we don't need to address it.
14 But again, it's just not as much of a pressing need as
15 a yard where a kid can get directly into it. That's
16 why we prioritize the yards over the pile. The more
17 highly contaminated ones we'd like to do first, and we
18 feel we can also control recontamination, and that
19 that wouldn't be an issue when we get to the pile.

20 MS. PASTOR: We want to give some other
21 people a chance to ask something.

22 Q. One more comment. There are kids playing
23 in the ground, and if you look at when the lead plant,
24 lead operation -- Most of the people in that area

1 still live in that area and grew up in it. They have
2 had no problems with lead. I'm one. I have lived
3 there all my life. I have played in the dirt. We
4 used to bake potatos in the dirt, and we used to dig
5 in it, and everything else. I still grow vegetables
6 in that. There is no after effects where you're any
7 worse than the kids are right now. Yet we are showing
8 you after effects; that there is none. So why are you
9 worried about it today with what diminished dust
10 levels and so forth that we are having compared to
11 what we had when we were a kid?

12 MR. BRADLEY: Well, actually, everybody
13 reacts differently to lead. And for every person that
14 says what you say, there are people who tell us that
15 they feel they have an impact on the lead with respect
16 to the lead levels. The air wasn't much higher prior
17 to 1983. However, the soil levels peaked right there,
18 and they really don't change much over time. So
19 levels weren't really as high in the past, because it
20 had not been established yet; it was still depositing
21 and building up.

22 But you are right that the smelter stack
23 in operation was a big problem. I don't know how to
24 answer that, because like I said, for everyone that

1 says there is not a problem, there are other people
2 who will say the opposite. And there was a blood
3 study done, and 16 percent of the kids that were under
4 six years old had a level that was over 10 micrograms
5 per deciliter, which is what health officials are
6 saying is a level of concern. So basically, I'd have
7 to disagree with that.

8 MS. PASTOR: There were some other people
9 with hands up. You had a question?

10 Q. I wanted to comment.

11 MS. PASTOR: We aren't doing comments
12 now. We'll come back to comments. Let's let people
13 get their questions off their chest.

14 Q. I'd like to address some situations that
15 existed during the comment section.

16 MS. PASTOR: We will catch you during the
17 comment portion.

18 Q. I'd like to know how much money has been
19 spent totally so far of this project from the time it
20 started until -- started to study it, through all the
21 legal fees, the cleanup, the studies that you have
22 done, and I'd like to know -- I know you don't have
23 that figure, but if you ballpark it for me? The fact
24 that you've chosen the least expensive solution to the

1 pile in not moving it, does that have anything to do
2 with the current Congress, change in Congress? Does
3 it have anything to do the Superfund being -- coming
4 up for --

5 MS. PASTOR: Reauthorization?

6 Q. Thank you. -- reauthorization? Or is
7 there a tie-in there? Because it seems that from the
8 time that you started addressing this you seemed to be
9 most concerned about the health, and then not moving
10 the pile seems to go against that. I wonder, is there
11 a connection with it?

12 MR. BRADLEY: Okay. Actually, I think
13 you asked about three questions, maybe more than that.
14 But I can't speak for the legal costs of the
15 responsible parties. I have no idea what they have
16 spent. I don't know that, or have an accounting.
17 EPA's own legal cost, what we have spent, we did
18 not -- EPA did not do remedial inspection of this
19 project. That's NL Industries did. I don't know that
20 they ever gave us a price quote on that. It generally
21 runs in the range of -- back then, probably \$400,000
22 to \$800,000.

23 I know what EPA has spent on design.
24 Designing, in large part, involved testing everyone's

1 yard to see what each yard's lead level was, whether
2 or not we needed to clean it up. We've spent about
3 two and a half million on designing, testing, and
4 sampling ground water, and all of those activities
5 that don't have to do with cleaning it up. What we've
6 spent on cleaning it up, so far the bulk of which was
7 spent in Eagle Park and Venice with the battery chip
8 area is about \$13 million, and we have some left to do
9 in those areas. We just started to get into the yards
10 in Granite City, and basically the yards that are
11 impacted by the stack emission -- I really don't know
12 what the legal costs add up to. Now, as far as a
13 change in the Congress, I don't really see that that
14 figured in. What we did was when we had that, and
15 significant information in the form of ground water
16 data, they told us now we have ground water
17 contamination, it really pivoted on whether or not you
18 filtered the sample, filtered the sample after -- I'm
19 sorry. Not after you took them out. This
20 contamination had been there before. It's just the
21 state of the art at the time was to filter those
22 samples. That's why.

23 Q. You didn't change your plan -- Didn't you
24 not change your mind to renew the first time around?

1 MR. BRADLEY: No, we didn't. No. The
2 plan in 1990 was to cap the pile. Basically, what is
3 being proposed today.

4 Q. So how was the ground water affected?
5 There is lead in the ground water. How does that
6 factor into anything?

7 MR. BRADLEY: Well, what it did was we
8 felt we had to reevaluate it, because if the pile were
9 there, there were no ground water contamination coming
10 from a miracle, and you really have a doubt in the
11 first place, then that's a different situation. We
12 need to look at it again. But we know where the
13 ground water contamination came from. So we look at
14 it. Really, no one drinks it. And we looked. We did
15 a lot of the studies on the pile trying to figure out,
16 is there any way -- We knew it was extensive back in
17 1990. Is there something new that came up that would
18 be able to take care of it, completely remove it for a
19 lot less? Is there anything new on it? There really
20 isn't. We did some specific studies on the pile to
21 see how successful dust control measures might be,
22 because that figures in a lot. And also we did some
23 specific tests that would be relevant to whether a
24 secondary lead smelter, because that may have -- We

1 felt that might be a more affordable option than say
2 landfill, or some of the other things that were
3 available. So we did these studies, and we've
4 included that \$5 million to cap it versus \$35 million
5 to is the best estimate we've got out there to do
6 anything that has full removal of the pile involved.
7 We are not really getting the benefit back from it. I
8 don't really necessarily think that leaving the pile
9 is a more lenient remedy, if that's the way you want
10 to put it. In the short-term, it's better, because
11 you don't have to move that entire pile. So your
12 short-term effect from any dust that might be
13 generated, or even the fact that you have to manage
14 that dust is environmentally diminished by just having
15 to grade some of the pile, instead of moving the whole
16 thing. So, it's better in that respect.

17 What it doesn't do is get rid of the
18 source of the ground water contamination. So what we
19 are doing to address that is the combination of
20 capping the pile, and containing the flume is going to
21 be effective in taking care of all of the possible
22 health problems that could come from that pile. And
23 it's roughly \$30 million less than getting the pile
24 out and downsizing the ground water. If the pile is

1 off, you obviously don't need to contain it, at least
2 as long, if at all. But that's not the expensive
3 part. The expensive part is removing the pile

4 Q. When do you plan to start cleaning up the
5 yards at the present time?

6 MR. BRADLEY: Okay. That is sort of a
7 side subject, but we have --

8 Q. Not for me.

9 MR. BRADLEY: I know that's real
10 important to you, and I have no problem answering it.
11 We had a temporary restraining order filed against us
12 by the City of Granite City when we started to clean
13 up some yards. Ultimately, the resolution of that
14 action was that we, the EPA, cleaned up 17 more
15 residences, which were all in the 1400 block area of
16 Grand, Madison, and State, and that we would -- There
17 were several other, you know, details to that; such as
18 a study that would be conducted by Granite City during
19 that period of time. But also we were to conduct
20 another public comment period. That is something we
21 actually agreed to before this temporary restraining
22 order all rolled up into the same agreement. We've
23 conducted that public comment period on the 500 parts
24 per million soil cleanup level. It was extended

1 twice. The comment period itself, it ended on January
2 13 of this year. We received extensive comments,
3 primarily from the responsible parties and the City of
4 Granite City that required us to, you know, actually
5 take a lot of time to answer them. So as soon as we
6 get our responsiveness summary out to those comments,
7 and a decision document saying what is the cleanup
8 level for the residential soil, we can then pursue
9 cleaning up more yards, which is really what we would
10 like to get going on. But that is what happened.
11 That was extended a couple times to January 13,
12 ultimately, and then we've had, you know, it's taken a
13 lot of time.

14 Q. Do you have a target date?

15 MR. BRADLEY: I can't really pin anything
16 down. We are going to try to get it done in April.
17 That's about all I can say. We'll try to get out and
18 start cleaning up residential yards, probably mostly
19 in our area where we would start in April, as soon as
20 we get that decision out. We will try to clean them
21 up as soon as possible after that. We are tied to
22 that in a court agreement right now.

23 Q. Will this decision that you are coming
24 to, will that change your parts per million, or is

1 that anything to do with your decision on this?

2 MR. BRADLEY: You mean what we are here
3 for today?

4 Q. No. You're sounding like now it's 500.
5 Is this going to be raised, complying with somebody
6 else's demands or wishes?

7 MR. BRADLEY: Well, I can't really say
8 that, because we are not answering all the comments.
9 We are going to, you know, make a statement on that
10 once we get all the comments and have evaluated the
11 whole situation. I mean, if I said something now,
12 it's really before the decision has been made. I
13 really can't say. I don't know what it is, but that
14 decision, when we close out this court agreement, that
15 is the decision that we will be printing. And it will
16 also attach responses to all of the comments that we
17 are receiving. So that's the decision I'm talking
18 about that will come.

19 Q. So we should hear something by the first
20 part of April?

21 MR. BRADLEY: That is what I certainly
22 hope you do.

23 Q. He is not going to have it the first part
24 of April. You are not going to get comments in then.

1 MR. BRADLEY: He is talking about
2 something else. That was a comment period that ended
3 January 13. That has to do solely with the
4 residential soil cleanup level. What we are here to
5 do in this comment period currently would end about
6 April 18 is for the pile, ground water, and remaining
7 removal fill areas. It has nothing to do with we say
8 for the residential.

9 Q. Has anybody in the general area in the
10 16, 17 and 1800 blocks, have any of them been asked
11 to, or given a questionnaire, or given what their
12 opinion was on the lead level?

13 MR. BRADLEY: No, not to my knowledge.
14 At least --

15 Q. Getting back to the ground water, I have
16 a series of questions, so please bear with me. First
17 of all, what do you anticipate to be the flow, hourly
18 flowing of the pumping that you will be doing, hourly,
19 daily? How many gallons are we talking about?

20 MR. BRADLEY: Well, I don't have that
21 answer on the tip of my tongue. But it's ultimately
22 something that I can certainly look up. One thing I
23 can say regarding that subject, this is something that
24 we did converse with the public owned treatment works

1 on this. So we know they can handle this. It's not
2 something we picked and didn't know whether or not
3 they could handle. I don't know offhand. I don't
4 have a document I could look at in five seconds.

5 Q. Brad, I specifically talked with the
6 treatment plant operator, and he indicated that no one
7 from EPA addressed or approached the City with
8 treating this affluent.

9 MR. BRADLEY: It could have been someone
10 from Wood River. It wouldn't have been EPA employees.
11 They are not the ones that did the research for the
12 cost estimates. I don't know. I'd have to talk to
13 them myself. I don't know.

14 Q. How many years of pumping do you
15 anticipate?

16 MR. BRADLEY: Well, we stated for costing
17 purposes 30 years, which is the degree that we are --
18 Typically, what we do in a situation like this, it
19 really depends on; one, how far it's gone; two,
20 whether or not the capping will control the leaching
21 from that power to a point where the standards could
22 be met quickly. In which case it wouldn't be a lot of
23 years. Or three, what if the leaching rate out of
24 that pile continues to be at the level over which is

1 the standards, in which case the pumping would go on
2 indefinitely.

3 Q. Did you figure that cost in your \$3
4 million estimate for the ground water?

5 MR. BRADLEY: We figured that in a 30
6 year operation.

7 Q. Of pumping?

8 MR. BRADLEY: Yes.

12
9 Q. So you do have numbers as to what the
10 volume will be, and the amount of lead in the water,
11 because realistically, this lead you're pumping is
12 going to end up in your sludge, and the City could be
13 very, very badly impacted by this. Our sludge, if the
14 lead content raises too high, then we are stuck with
15 handling a special or hazardous waste. The cost for
16 disposing would go up radically. The cost to all of
17 our industrial users in town that put into that amount
18 of lead into the waste stream will go up dramatically,
19 because Illinois EPA will require us to maintain our
20 levels, acceptable levels of lead in the waste
21 treatment. I mean, these types of, you know -- Just
22 to say we are going to pump this into Granite City's
23 treatment plant --

24 MR. BRADLEY: I didn't say Granite City,

1 but --

2 Q. That's the regional waste water treatment
3 plant. That is the only thing available to you in
4 this area.

5 MR. BRADLEY: I didn't say it. You said
6 it. But we did research that, and we are basically
7 told that, you know, the levels would be acceptable.
8 That is something that certainly I can answer later,
9 if you want to call me on that. I don't have those
10 numbers offhand. That is sort of a fine detail that
11 is stuffed in the cost estimate.

12 Q. The last question I have regarding the
13 ground water problem is: What is the contingency
14 plan? You indicated that treating this is a
15 relatively simple process. What if it isn't? What if
16 it doesn't work? What if the flume is halfway to the
17 river? What are you going to do if you can't contain
18 it? What is the contingency plan?

19 MR. BRADLEY: Well, I do not feel we'd
20 have a problem containing it. It can be contained.
21 The question is, obviously, if it goes a half-mile,
22 there is a lot more involved in containing it. We
23 need to put more monitoring wells in, and get access
24 to that, because they will be off the site that we

1 initially put all the wells on, and see how far it's
2 gone. We have, you know, estimates of how far it's
3 gone. We have to see whether that is the case, base
4 it on the flow right how long we feels it's been
5 leaching in. And we don't really have a "contingency
6 plan," because we really feel this will work. I don't
7 see any reason why we couldn't develop one. It's
8 actually something we've used on other aspects of this
9 cleanup, or we have 'what if' contingency plans. But
10 we have not proposed that. Let's see.

11 Q. Brad, can I ask one question of Illinois
12 EPA?

13 MR. BRADLEY: It's up to them.

14 Q. Regarding the ground water, have you
15 signed off on your plan for the ground water?

16 MR. ROGERS: No, I have not.

17 Q. I would like to remind the Illinois EPA
18 within the City of Granite City, and I am sure the
19 surrounding communities, millions of dollars has been
20 spent in remediation, protecting the same operation
21 dealing with this lead pile that's working mainly with
22 the gas removal, hydrocarbon contamination, et cetera.
23 I think it's absurd for this same -- I mean, if the
24 argument is going to be nobody is drinking this water,

1 then why have millions of dollars been spent cleaning
2 up the asbestos? I think it's very important for the
3 Illinois EPA to remain consistent, and recognize that
4 it's going to be very difficult for them to maintain
5 credibility and enforce a plan that they have been
6 enforcing all along, including underground water
7 contamination, and then to embrace the plan. I
8 encourage you to look very carefully, and think about
9 your credibility.

10 MS. PASTOR: Let's give someone else
11 another chance to ask questions.

12 Q. Brad, you talked about recontamination.
13 I know we are not here for the residential part of
14 this, but theoretically, since the smelter has been
15 shut down you're eliminating the primary source of the
16 lead, has there been any retesting in the 1400 blocks
17 of State, Grand, and Madison Avenue since that has
18 been cleaned up and done to determine if there has
19 been any recontamination? Is it too soon to do that?

20 MR. BRADLEY: We'll, we haven't done
21 that. It's something that we probably will do,
22 because we feel. Obviously, that we don't want that
23 to occur. I think, as far as recontamination goes,
24 currently the biggest threat is some trucking lots

1 that are right around the pile where, you know, when
2 they get -- Lots of trucks do the turn-around in them.
3 They get some rather extensive dust. And what we've
4 done is we've paved those areas with dust control,
5 trying to keep that down until we can remediate those
6 areas. One of them is on the main industrial area.
7 That will get remediated. We really need to get, you
8 know, a decision made on these issues that we are
9 here to talk about tonight before we've conceded what
10 we need to do to clear that up. So I -- That's what
11 we are trying to address, those threats. We have not
12 done any testing. I think it might be a bit soon to
13 do that. I know of other studies that have been done
14 on recontamination. I think, in this case, we
15 probably should just check that ourselves. I don't
16 feel that it will probably be very extensive. But we
17 need to control those dust sources, because I think
18 that could be lead to some type of -- Probably, I
19 think that what is what the rear of the pile will only
20 be a problem, you know, at the time when it's being
21 graded. It really isn't a significant source right
22 now, and we will need -- We will use dust control
23 measures at the point. We feel that whatever we want
24 to do with it. It's been graded, but the truck

1 lots -- Really no one is doing it, unless we do so.
2 That is why we were putting that into play recently.

3 Q. What is the lead level of the soil that
4 you brought in to repace the soil in these yards in
5 Granite? For example, did you test it before you put
6 it in?

7 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. Yeah. That's one of
8 the tests we got already. We wouldn't want to put
9 something back that is over 500 parts per million.
10 Generally, it runs from 150 to 100 parts per million,
11 more to the lower end.

12 Q. You'd have to lower that anyway, wouldn't
13 recontamination to --

14 MR. BRADLEY: Right. The real concern
15 that the EPA would have is if it gets back over the
16 level that is protected. It's not to say if it goes
17 from a hundred up to 300 we wouldn't be concerned.
18 Obviously, that is not good. But we are really
19 concerned to see whether it would actually go back
20 over 500. It's something, you know -- Really, to
21 answer your question, it's something we are going to
22 need to look at since we've replaced some of these
23 yards recently.

24 We do have sort of a complicating factor

1 to that in that we really want to remediate entire
2 areas at a time with similar contaminant levels. You
3 know starting and stopped by temporary restraining
4 orders, and other concerns, and that really doesn't
5 help with our trying to prevent recontamination.
6 Because if we could do the whole area that's is the
7 best possible scenario. If we do 17 of them in an
8 area, and the whole surrounding area doesn't get
9 addressed, yet then it can get tracked back and forth
10 between those yards. So in a sense, the
11 recontamination effort has, in my opinion, been hurt,
12 because I don't want to see it happen, but the
13 recontamination has been -- the potential for it has
14 been decreased, at least slowed down, the residential
15 soil cleanup, which is not the way we wanted to
16 proceed.

17 Q. You had stated just a few minutes ago
18 that EPA has allocated \$3 million for the ground water
19 wells. Is that simply for the installation? And if
20 it is, how many wells will be installed, and how deep
21 will those wells be, and what size will the force
22 field be on those wells?

23 MR. BRADLEY: Well, really I haven't
24 allocated any money. This a proposed plan. We've

1 received comments on it, and the types of questions
2 you have are going to really be defined in the
3 decision portion. If we actually implement that, and
4 that that cost is really a total cost, and that's
5 installation.

6 Q. So that's for installation and operation?

7 MR. BRADLEY: Operation for 30 years.

8 Q. Thirty years?

9 MR. BRADLEY: That is typically what
10 we -- Yeah.

11 Q. I think \$3 million, sir, is unrealistic,
12 extremely unrealistic. We have industries that pay
13 over a half a million a year for affluent. I'm asking
14 what the flow was going to be from those wells and
15 everything. That is what I'm questioning the cost
16 estimates on.

17 MR. BRADLEY: Okay.

18 Q. If you decide to remove the lead pile,
19 you will still have the ground water problem anyhow;
20 right?

21 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah, what has already
22 leached.

23 Q. How long will it take?

24 MR. BRADLEY: What has already leached

1 there is still nothing to continue to feed it.

2 Q. How long would it take to clean up the
3 existing ground water, if you remove the lead pile
4 completely? How many years?

5 MR. BRADLEY: I don't know. I can't
6 accurately figure, but it wouldn't take very long,
7 because you would know the exact shape of your flume.
8 The pile would be out of the way. We could put wells
9 throughout.

10 Q. Regardless of if you remove the pile or
11 not, you still have the ground water situation?

12 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. What has already
13 leached out is there. It has to be dealt with. The
14 real question is what is going to leak out in the
15 future through capping of it, and then obviously
16 nothing will leak out if you fully remove everything.

17 Q. So whether you remove the pile or not,
18 you still have a ground water situation?

19 A. What has already leaked out is --

20 Q. Shorter term?

21 MS. PASTOR: Someone else had a question
22 that hasn't had a chance to ask it?

23 Q. This question is for the money. Is this
24 being federal money, or state, city, county?

1 MR. BRADLEY: Well, here is how it works:
2 It's not City. It's not County. Right now, it's been
3 Federal, because the companies that are potentially
4 responsible for contamination, the EPA and these
5 companies have not agreed on the cleanup plan. They
6 are not currently putting in into place; we are. So
7 right now it's Federal money. When we spend Federal
8 money to clean up a Superfund site, which is on the
9 National Priorities List, the state EPA, which this
10 is, which the state itself kicks in ten percent on
11 that. Right now, it's federal. It's 90 percent
12 federal, and ten percent state. And it could be the
13 responsible parties, if we get a settlement, and EPA
14 agrees to implement the cleanup. That's what we
15 wanted to do up front at the beginning, but it didn't
16 work out.

17 Q. Can I ask another question, or are you
18 over a time period? Say since the mid '60's to the
19 present date, have you tried to run a water table
20 analysis on this area in Granite City?

21 MR. BRADLEY: Well, we haven't done it
22 since the mid '60's. We've been involved.

23 Q. I knew this back then.

24 MR. BRADLEY: About '85, in there

1 somewhere, Illinois EPA did. That might take us back
2 to about '83, maybe a little over that.

3 Q. That's only excuse about your flume
4 you're talking about? I was around town for a long
5 time, and I know that sometimes the water table is
6 very shallow, and sometimes it's very deep. I
7 guess --

8 MR. BRADLEY: Well, it fluctuates a lot.

9 Q. In '93 it was probably over the top of
10 the water table.

11 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. I think you were
12 standing in the water table. It does fluctuate a lot.
13 You would expect that in an area that is very close to
14 a significant body of water, the Mississippi River.
15 And also roughly in the flood zone. Some part of --
16 Some parts around, and, yeah, that is generally what
17 you see. It will fluctuate. And I would say that the
18 only trend I have really seen over this 10 years now
19 is it seems to be a little bit lower on the average
20 than it was 10 years ago. A lot of the wells we've
21 drilled to check the shallow water quality are dry.
22 They were dry sometimes 10 years ago, but they were
23 drilles certainly not to be dry. I mean, I would say
24 it;s gone down a little bit over the last 10 years. I

1 am not sure why.

2 Q. I mean, to be perfectly honest, when we
3 was having hard rain, let's say, our sewage treatment
4 plant has problems handling that water. Are you going
5 to have somebody down there to shut off your little
6 pumping pumps when the water volume is high, and turn
7 them back on when the volume is low, or are you just
8 going to pump this leaded water right on out into the
9 Mississippi River?

10 MR. BRADLEY: Well, we wouldn't bypass
11 the system in the treatment plant.

12 Q. What is going to happen in the treatment
13 plant is going to happen that they can't handle it?

14 MR. BRADLEY: Well, let me explain that
15 the ground water is very slowly -- I don't think if we
16 get in a situation where we would have to shut some
17 wells off, it's not going to impact the flume much at
18 all to temporarily shut it down. Water is moving so
19 slow that we're pulling it back. Then shut it down
20 for release it, or we want to get out beyond what we
21 initially pulled it back from in the first place. I
22 don't see that that would be a problem, unless it was
23 like a terminal problem in which case we would have to
24 find something else to do. I don't know if the water

1 moves so slowly as you get closer to the river.

2 Q. Well, I would just go back again then I
3 will yield the floor, I can remember in the '60's, for
4 example, when you had Union Starch, the different
5 steel mills that's been closed down, A. O. Smith,
6 people like that before water out you have the ground
7 instead of pumping it in from the Mississippi River.
8 We didn't have basement busted things of that nature
9 and I know since a lot of the industries went out of
10 business obviously this water is going somewhere down
11 under the ground busting all the basements in the area
12 all over the city. I don't know how up are going to
13 make flume stay the same size when that water, if you
14 pump two million gallons of water a day out of the
15 ground and then quit, or you put it back, you know,
16 because maybe you explained it, and I didn't absorb it

15
17 MR. BRADLEY: In the absence of another
18 pumping source, which there really aren't many in the
19 area, like you said, there is a lot of the industrial
20 use is gone the ground water will move in a
21 predictable direction. So you know where to place
22 your wells. If you want to catch that contaminant
23 flume and keep it from going any further, you will
24 know exactly where to put the wells to do. The only

1 question is how many and what pumping, you know, you
2 might not pump a little bit faster flow use. That is
3 where design comes in. But it's moving in a
4 predictable direction. And if the flume, you know,
5 let's say, is shaped like a pear, like I said, you
6 don't put wells in close, you put them a little bit --
7 pull them back from your main source. If the area you
8 are drawing from includes the edge of the flume, don't
9 put the well right at the end. If you were to shut
10 that down, it takes that water awhile to recover,
11 because you have depressed a lot of the water table
12 right around the well, and it takes awhile to totally
13 recover, and then move on again. And it moves so slow
14 that if you shut it down for a couple of days, it will
15 never recover: Most of the area which we are trying
16 to capture it in anyway. The reason it works is
17 because the flume is a predictable direction, and
18 predictable rate. If it moved in all directions, it
19 would probably be impossible to deal with it. You
20 know exactly how it works.

21 Q. I think what he is mentioning is
22 drinking. I mean, many people drink. You haven't had
23 a chance to address the problem. You people have
24 designed the system. You haven't really figured out

1 how much water you are going to have to take out, and
2 what you are going to do with it, bringing up this
3 problem that you need to address before you come up
4 with your final conclusion. And what you are going to
5 do. How are you going to do, or else there is going
6 to be a lot of trouble. That is what he is bringing up
7 to you here, some of the other things we've all
8 brought up to you you. We realize licenses that you
9 are making, let's say, an approximation and so forth
10 right now without hard facts. What you need -- the
11 fact is some state conclusions there and that's the
12 whole thing. In all of this just like the removal of
13 the pile. You say that costs too much. I think you
14 need to get some expertise in to estimate alternatives
15 of how to remove the pile, say organic separation,
16 meaning separating the organic from the lead constant.
17 Smelt the lead, and you may find that in the long run
18 it may be cheaper and easier and eliminate a lot of
19 the, let's say, long-term problems that everybody is
20 worried about.

21 MR. BRADLEY: Well, we've done
22 significant research on the pile. And I feel
23 confident in saying --

24 Q. We haven't seen it.

1 MR. BRADLEY: -- the cost estimates are
2 solid, and you will see a drastic difference in the
3 cost between removing it and capping it. I don't
4 think we have --

5 Q. You have this knowledge?

6 MR. BRADLEY: What's that?

7 A. Do you have those figures published that
8 anybody can see?

9 MR. BRADLEY: They are in the second
10 addendum to the study, which is in the library. And
11 we are finalizing the pilot study report, and we will
12 get that in the library as soon as possible. And
13 that's really what came out of the pilot test on the
14 pilot. That report is what we used in the feasibility
15 study. It's more detailed, but it's summarized
16 feasibility study as is. And we have looked into the
17 water city approach at your comment, and those are
18 things we do have to look at, but we have done initial
19 research on that just, you know, without contacting
20 people. We did attempt to reach the people.

21 MS. PASTOR: Did you have your hand up?

22 Q. The sludge treatment plant, is that at
23 Chauteau Island, and that landfill is adjacent to the
24 water intake across from the water intake from St.

1 Louis, and it's adjacent to the water pump leads to
2 Granite City. Have you taken that fact into
3 consideration? I know that Craig indicated that it's
4 tested, but I mean, of all the expenses are those
5 possible expenses for the next 30 years, are they
6 realistically estimated for all contingencies for that
7 and will the PRP still be liable? Who is liable then?
8 Who, the taxpayers, the City, or who?

9 MR. BRADLEY: It won't be the City. I
10 don't know if the City will be. The PRP's never
11 really get out of the cost. So they would still be
12 liable in some way, shape, or form. See, one thing I
13 don't know is what the lead level of the smelter is
14 right now, I don't know the industry in the area are
15 putting in there to begin with. I don't know that
16 offhand. So I am not sure this is going to, you know,
17 are we going to double that is going to be
18 significant, because I don't know what the level is
19 right now, but what we did do is contact one and ask
20 them if they could handle types of levels that we had
21 been dealing with and volumes and we were told that is
22 something that it could handle. That is what we are
23 basing it on. I don't really know all the details
24 about the island and intakes. I think that is

1 something that probably is taken into consideration
2 set whatever standards they have for the subject.

3 Q. Who owns the land that is under the pile,
4 and who owns it afterwards?

5 MR. BRADLEY: The pile itself, that's
6 Taracorp's land, and --

7 Q. Everything, or part of it?

8 MR. BRADLEY: No, not every single part
9 of it, but 99 percent of it. But there is a few
10 little sub-piles that were something that St. Louis
11 Lead Recyclers never processed. They shut down and
12 left some material they brought in. They put it back.
13 I do believe that is out off Taracorp's property line.
14 The majority of the pile is on Taracorp's property,
15 and that is who would own it afterwards. The pile
16 would be expanded, though, and to cap it sloped.
17 either the slope requirements, it would get area-wise
18 it would get larger.

19 Q. Where will it expand, Brad, which
20 direction?

21 MR. BRADLEY: Well, we would prefer that
22 it would expand toward BV&G Transport. But really
23 that's a legal question. We have to work it out. We
24 could also expand it toward Trust 454. That would

1 make it larger and thinner. It may be a combination
2 of both would be best.

3 Q. Has property acquisition been included in
4 the capping cost? If I owned that property, it would
5 be awful expensive if you wanted to buy it.

6 MR. BRADLEY: Except that you are a PRP.
7 I mean, we have considered that in all of what we've
8 done. I don't know that there is going to be a cost
9 associated with it, because the people that own that
10 have a liability, too. So I am not sure exactly what
11 that is going to look like, but it has been figured.

12 Q. The intent is to come toward State
13 Street?

14 MR. BRADLEY: That would be the
15 preference. You know, we have to take respective land
16 owners, or see what --

17 Q. Why wouldn't you go the other way?

18 MR. BRADLEY: What, toward Trust 454?

19 Q. Yeah, toward that itself, or toward the
20 river, away from the City itself.

21 MR. BRADLEY: Well, we --

22 Q. And the buildings, what do they do with
23 them? They are not using them necessarily in all
24 cases.

1 MR. BRADLEY: I don't think we want to
2 get involved in knocking buildings down.

3 Q. It's your property; why not?

4 MR. BRADLEY: Well, it certainly wouldn't
5 be our approach to do that.

6 MS. PASTOR: Is there a microphone? Any
7 other questions out there?

8 Q. I thought I better ask a question so I
9 can get my comments in. And I feel that we have a
10 credibility problem, as Mr. Tarpoff said. We have
11 self members of the Council -- I'm Rasmir Skubish.
12 I'm one of the members of the City Council. We have
13 the question of whether our comments and our questions
14 that you have addressed will be heard by the people
15 that make the record of decision. Will this be
16 ascertained by people on our motions and comments to
17 see what the general opinion of the population here
18 is?

19 MR. BRADLEY: Yes.

20 Q. It will?

21 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. Yeah, I will be
22 involved in writing a record of decision, whatever
23 decision document comes out of this. And so
24 obviously, I'm hearing it now. It's also something

--
--
1 that we are having a record written down on. And,
2 yes, this will be absolute.

3 Q. We have a terrible credibility problem,
4 because back 17 years ago Granite City used to have an
5 air pollution control board. It not notified Illinois
6 EPA, U.S. EPA and contacted National lead about the
7 lead pile going, and the Illinois EPA and at that time
8 took and assumed responsibility to clean up the area,
9 and nothing had been done.

10 But going further back than that, we have
11 people that live to be 90 or better. Some of them
12 work at the old Heart Metal Company -- That's the
13 origin of that company that used to make lead pellets
14 and bb's for air rifles the kids used to shoot birds
15 and such as that. They sold to National Lead, and
16 National Lead to Taracorp. And all of that time that
17 was involved we never heard of people getting sick
18 from lead, and never heard of anything that the
19 Illinois EPA had done since 17 years ago, or the
20 federal people did and now we are here with the
21 problem of spending huge amounts of money then that
22 Granite City recently the population has recently in
23 speaking in speaking to our constituents and our
24 friends, our friends would rather remove the pile

1 completely to eliminate an eye sore. I Would will be
2 policemen I can for to us carry on now until forever,
3 unless that pile was removed. It's going to be talked
4 about because of the fact that we don't want another
5 incident like Time Square in Missouri. Then the
6 federal EPA and other people associated with Time
7 Squares recognized that they made a mistake. We don't
8 want the same kind of mistake sake that happened right
9 here. But can you ask ascertain a people living here
10 for years and years. You don't come in with health
11 problems until now, five years ago. Until this
12 particular time. What we really need to address, if
13 you want to do something worthwhile, if the people
14 that hear this, these comments and questions, make a
15 decision to remove the pile. It's as simple as that.
16 We know there is lot of the money spent federal money
17 from the Supertind, but if there is some good to be a
18 obtained by that fact, that's what our people and our
19 friends want to see, the pile removed. If that's the
20 alternative, then it seems like a community based on
21 your targets there were identified remedies. For one,
22 don't you place community welfare number nine. It
23 should be the number one priority, because we live
24 here. We are human. We are thinking. of our health

1 factors; personal and public health, both. I know
2 councilmen here feel the same way. That's the things
3 that the record of decision makers will have to bear
4 in mind. Otherwise, I think it's useless. Thank you.

5 MS. PASTOR: Someone else have a
6 question? Did have you a question that you wanted to
7 ask?

8 Q. I have got a question. You're talking
9 about all this contaminated water that you are going
10 to drag off this area around the pile, and by the time
11 they get it through to the treatment plant, will it be
12 so diluted that the content will be so low that it
13 wouldn't make any difference one way or the other?

14 MR. BRADLEY: Well, that's a possibility.
15 What probably will happen is that the lead levels in
16 the flow will be looked at. They will see what they
17 need to be treated, if anything. And I don't know it
18 will be so diluted that it wouldn't do anything. It's
19 a good question. We also have the fact that some of
20 the wells that we'll be pumping from may not have the
21 higher levels. so within our own system we are going
22 to dilute it. You won't see the highest level come in
23 from our pipe. It would be mixed in. It would be
24 wells throughout the flume, and some of them will be

--
--
1 pumping from relatively clean areas. There will be
2 dilution within our own system. I don't know whether
3 it would be diluted. I really wouldn't treat it. I
4 guess it would have some treatment involved.

5 Q. You're planning on piping directly to the
6 treatment plant; aren't you?

7 MR. BURROUGHS: I just want to jump in
8 here. I have not seen the whole study, since I'm new
9 on this whole in your fact sheet here it says that if
10 the extraction will well on-site if necessary the
11 ground water will be treated on-site, prior to
12 discharge POTW. What I'm getting out of this is that
13 your ground water will be treated on-site to the
14 standard where it can be accepted by the POTW for
15 discharge into the only safe surface water stream. So
16 I am thinking there is no surface water stream nearby
17 discharging their POTW with discharged treated ground
18 water, but it's not POTW will be compromising the
19 standard. It needs to be treated to discharge it.
20 That is accurate, I am assuming, by looking at this.

21 MR. BRADLEY: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. That's
22 what our plan is. I mean, you can do it one of two
23 ways. I know sometimes that the POTW actually does
24 some treatment themselves. But in this case we are

1 taking the stand that we should actually treat it
2 before it gets there. I guess that really is the
3 safest approach in a sense that comes up with sludge
4 problems and really get our own liability involved
5 that way. We can knock it from the front. I guess,
6 if we make some kind of sludge, or some type of solid
7 out of that, we could deal with it ourselves, which is
8 a minimal impact, and certainly less costly in the
9 long run, if it were to create some kind of problem in
10 the POTW it. That's a correct summary. Yeah.

11 MS. PASTOR: She had her hand up. I am
12 just going to recognize her

13 Q. This was a follow-up with his.

14 MS. PASTOR: Go ahead.

15 Q. I'll just ask real quickly, Brad, what
16 exactly is going to be the configuration of the pile
17 when it's done? How tall? How wide? What size -- Is
18 it going to be solid enough to put some structure on
19 it, or exactly what is it?

20 MR. BRADLEY: Well, I don't know what
21 kind of structure you're talking about, but certainly
22 nothing that dig into it to for support. I don't
23 have the exact dimensions. We don't plan on making it
24 taller. We were aware from a public comment period

1 back in 1990 that that certainly is not a popular
2 idea. It also would create problems in containing, if
3 it's very steep and comes to a peak. It's harder to
4 maintain with a mower or whatever we need to keep
5 vegetation under control. They use a lot of the
6 superfund sites that we have have capped, and put caps
7 on them, and they can be used for beneficial uses like
8 parks, or some of them that are larger than that.
9 This would not be big enough, but they been used as
10 golf courses, and things like that. As far as
11 structures being put on it, obviously that would be
12 something we would put restrictions on it that you
13 can't really dig into it. You know, if someone wanted
14 to put a small structure on it, I don't know that we
15 would disallow that. But it certainly couldn't be --
16 It wouldn't have a foundation dug into the cap,
17 because then it would actually breach the purpose of
18 the cap.

19 Q. So it would be sitting go 15 feet tall?

20 MR. BRADLEY: No. It will be larger in
21 area. It will not be taller. Probably what will make
22 most of the increase in area will be the sloping
23 requirements for the pile. It slopes so steeply now,
24 it doesn't even come close to meeting the requirements

1 that we will have for the sloping. Some parts that
2 are sloping more gradually, but there are parts that
3 are sloping very steeply. Just to meet the sloping
4 requirements, the area will be increased. We can
5 bring a lot of the material that we have to dig up
6 from Trust 454, BV&G, and Rich oil in to help with
7 that. I don't know what the final area estimate of it
8 is. it will be bigger. It won't be as big as -- It
9 will be somewhere between three and a half and seven
10 acres, I would say.

11 Q. How high?

12 MR. BRADLEY: Maybe in the middle of
13 that -- I don't know exactly how high. You know,
14 that's something we need to design. it might be
15 better for some reason 15 feet or 20 feet. It
16 wouldn't be any higher than it is today. But we have
17 to think of the best way to place materials in some of
18 the low spots so we can minimize our grade. I don't
19 think we can get an answer at this stage exactly what
20 the things are looking like when they are designed.
21 When we have all the initial, upfront stuff done, then
22 we can. We can do an approximate cost, but we can't
23 design it it upfront, because that is putting a lot of
24 money into something that may have to be changed,,

1 based on the slopage

2 Q. You keep saying we, but has EPA taken
3 over ownership of the pile?

4 MR. BRADLEY: No. No. We will not take
5 over ownership, but the way it works is that there is
6 it depends on who implements it. Now, if EPA
7 continues to spend their money on this, then the
8 operation and maintenance is EPA's responsibility
9 while it gets turned over to the state. If the
10 potentially responsible parties actually come forward
11 and do this, then it's their responsibility, and will
12 be something that they do under a legal agreement. We
13 will never assume ownership of it. That obviously
14 isn't in our interest. We are just trying to clean up
15 up the problem, not get our own liability. You can
16 see we will maintain, and have this and -- I guess it
17 will depend on different people, depending on who does
18 it.

19 Q. In other words, Taracorp still owns the
20 property?

21 MR. BRADLEY: Yes, they do. There is a
22 whole liability to them for that pile, and ground
23 water that I don't want to even get into.

24 Q. Are you assuming --

1 MR. BRADLEY: George had his hand up.

2 Q. Are you going to pipe the water from your
3 pumps directly to the treatment plant, or are you
4 going to use locals?

5 MR. BRADLEY: Well, at some point out we
6 are going to treat it up front, and I assume we are
7 going to pipe it to the plant.

8 Q. Say we say that even if you treat it
9 there, if you let discharge -- I think you should pipe
10 it to a treatment plant, rather than use our local.

11 MR. BRADLEY: That's what I said we would
12 do.

13 Q. How about where the lead comes from in
14 Missouri? Are those --

15 MR. BRADLEY: I didn't hear the first
16 part.

17 Q. How about where the lead -- A lot of the
18 lead is lying in Missouri in those deep down mines.
19 Have you ever considered that all of this pile
20 actually putting in the mines from which it is
21 originally extracted as a fill?

22 MR. BRADLEY: Well, I guess, yeah, that
23 was considered for about a second, because whoever
24 owns that mine isn't going to want it. You know, they

1 don't want what they. They don't want to be adding to
2 it. So, yeah, I mean, it was considered. You know, I
3 don't think anyone would accept that. You still have
4 the removal cost and getting it there, and then it's
5 not safe as a land fill. There is nothing to say that
6 it wouldn't just leak out in the ground water after
7 you immediately put it down there.

8 Q. How about lining some of the tunnels in
9 the coal mines here in Collinsville with it? They've
10 probably started to sink, and using them as fill?

11 MR. BRADLEY: These aren't really viable
12 options. You're getting into a class of options I
13 don't think people would want that to happen. It's
14 not really a reasonable option.

15 Q. What do you treat the lead with to
16 neutralize it?

17 MR. BRADLEY: I don't know specifically.
18 You can -- There is chemicals that you can use to
19 basically draw lead out of water. It's a metal, and
20 you combine it with solids, or draw it down. I don't
21 know exactly what it is.

22 Q. Is there risk increase?

23 A. Well, I know that there are obviously
24 lead treatment problems other places in the country,

1 and I don't know how extensive that is compared to
2 treating and recycling. That is something that we've
3 costed it out, the whole process, and it's --

4 Q. You say the figure that you got for this
5 project --

6 MR. BRADLEY: Pardon.

7 Q. Are you limited to a certain figure for
8 this project?

9 A. No. No, we are not.

10 Q. In other words, if they gave you \$30 mill
11 to operate \$60 or \$100; there is no limit?

12 MR. BRADLEY: Well, it's not that there
13 is no limit. Nobody set a limit. No one said, 'You
14 don't get a \$100 million, or \$7 million.' We have to
15 always keep in mind the regulations that we have to
16 abide by, and the National Contingency Plan, which we
17 operate under. Because if we spent money that is not
18 consistent with the National Contingency Plan, we may
19 never get it back. We are not spending the money that
20 we've spent already, and just saying good-bye to it.
21 We are going to sue the response parties to try to get
22 that money back, and they may also face penalties for
23 not having done the work themselves. So we have to be
24 consistent with the National Contingency Plan, and

--
1 meet applicable laws. These are our limitations.
2 This is no doubt a Superfund site, but if you spend
3 money on something inappropriately, we wouldn't get it
4 back. That's a serious consideration.

5 MS. PASTOR: It looks like we are losing
6 a few people here. I wonder if I can move into the
7 comment portion of the meeting then at this time.
8 Then, like I said, maybe we can stay around and answer
9 a few questions.

10 At this point the comment period, comment
11 portion would be in the form of a statement or an
12 opinion, and a question. And that will be for the
13 record. As Brad said, all of those comments, along
14 with anything we get in writing that you can send to
15 us in the mail, or if you want to say something today.
16 We already have a comment period of time extension. So
17 you have plenty of time to go read up and send
18 something in, if you would like. Otherwise, if you
19 want to make a comment, raise your hand. We will have
20 you come up to the microphone. At this point, we want
21 to make sure the court reporter your name, and if you
22 are representing a particular organization, or an
23 agency, or form of government, or just yourself,
24 that's okay, too, but we want to make sure she gets

--
1 everything. So, if someone has a comment, a
2 statement, or something they'd like to say at this
3 point for the record, raise your hand and step on up.

4 We'll remain open for just one more
5 question now. You want to ask a question?

6 MR. SKUBISH: The comment I was going to
7 make then is the people that make the decision have
8 set a priority on personal, public health factors, or
9 will it be the dollars and sense business. You said
10 yourself you made add mix no ceiling, no limitation.
11 You said a \$100 million. Would the \$100 million come
12 first, or would the public health, personal health
13 come first? You can put that down as a comment. I
14 believe that they should remove the pile, and that
15 would eliminate a source of soreness right there.

16 MS. PASTOR: For the record, your name?

17 MR. SKUBISH: My name is Kasmir Skubish.
18 I live at 2701 Lincoln Avenue, Granite City.

19 MR. POLICHECK: I'd like to hear a
20 comment based to this gentleman's question. Make it
21 again.

22 MS. PASTOR: If you have just a statement
23 then, a thought, a question this is the time to say
24 it. Like I say, if you don't want to say it now think

1 it over and send us something, that's fine, too.

2 No comments? Okay. All right. Well, I
3 guess we will close this comment portion of the
4 meeting. Did you want to saying something? Okay.
5 Well, then, I guess we can end the meeting, if that's
6 okay with you. But we have the room for a little
7 while. So we will stay around, if you want to ask
8 Brad a particular question, or something special is on
9 your mind, we'll be glad to stay for a little while
10 and talk with you. Thank you for coming.

11
12
13 * * * * *